

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 19, 2007, Applicant submits this Amendment. New claims 13 and 14 are added, claims 9-10 were previously cancelled, and claims 1-8 and 11-14 are currently pending. No new matter is introduced.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0009420, to Jones over U.S. Patent No. 5,651,620, to Paranjpe and U.S. Publication No. 2001/0048830, to Nose et al.

As an initial matter, the Office Action characterizes Paranjpe as being “in the same field of printing machines.” However, the present invention is directed to a scanning device; not a printer. The invention in Paranjpe is directed to printers that permit use of one or more energy sources that accommodate more than one ribbon at once. Accordingly, the inventor would not have contemplated the disclosure in Paranjpe at the time of conception of the present invention. Therefore, Paranjpe is non-analogous art and cannot be combined with Jones and Nose et al. for purposes of an obviousness rejection.

Claim 1 recites, “the second image-scanner unit is mounted so as to be rotatable about an axis perpendicular to a path of movement of the paper document in order to be able to adopt a first angular position in which the second image-scanner unit is situated on one side of the path of movement in order to scan one face of the paper document and a second angular position to which the second image-scanner unit is rotated from the first angular position and in which the second image-scanner unit is situated on an opposite side of the path of movement in order to scan the other face of the document.” (Emphasis added.) The Examiner correctly recognizes that Jones fails to teach this feature of claim 1, however, it is asserted that Paranjpe discloses this feature.

Even if Paranjpe was considered to be analogous, it fails to teach the deficiencies of Jones. On page 5 of the Office Action, it is suggested that rotation of the printer head 171 facilitates printing on opposing faces of the document. Applicant respectfully disagrees. A closer look at the Paranjpe disclosure reveals that Paranjpe actually teaches away from printing on both sides of the document because Paranjpe explicitly states that only one side of the document is printed on. At column 10, lines 4-11, Paranjpe states, “the side of a sheet of

substrate that faced onto first ribbon 102 in passing point C, upon that sheet being moved into fourth guide 150 ... will similarly be facing toward second ribbon 108 upon reaching point D. Therefore, the printing processes that are carried out at points C and D ... will ... be applied to just that one side of a sheet of substrate.” (Emphasis added.) Accordingly, Paranjpe, in addition to failing to disclose an image scanner, it also fails to disclose a rotatable image-scanner, which facilitates scanning both sides of a document, as is claimed in claim 1.

This interpretation of Paranjpe is consistent with other portions in that disclosure. For example, at column 10, lines 43-46, Paranjpe states, “[a]gain, the side of such a sheet that was facing towards second ribbon 108 near point D will similarly face first ribbon 102 near point C.” (Emphasis added). Further, at column 10, lines 59-61, Paranjpe states, “[o]ne side of the sheet will have been exposed to both of first and second ribbons 102, 108 so as to permit printing from both such ribbons onto that facing side of the sheet.” Similarly, at column 11, lines 33-44, Paranjpe states, “[i]t must be also noted that while a sheet of substrate having been passed into either of third and fourth guides 148, 150 and then onwardly to the other of third and fourth guides 148, 150 will be printed upon just one side thereof. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, even if printing was considered to be analogous to scanning, Paranjpe, in addition to failing to disclose printing on both sides of the document, it teaches away from the features of claim 1. Furthermore, Nose et al. does not fulfill the deficiencies in Jones and Paranjpe with respect to a rotatable scanner moveable between two angular positions configured to allow scanning of both sides of a document.

Additionally, there must be some teaching, motivation or suggestion to combine references for purposes of obviousness. If the proposed modification renders the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose or if it changes the principal of operation thereof, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. MPEP 2143.01.IV and 2143.01.V. In this instance there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Jones by replacing its scanners with the printers of Paranjpe because the intended purpose of the device in Jones is to scan documents, not print them, and thus, this modification would render Jones unsatisfactory for its intended purposes and change its principal of operation.

Application No. 10/774,334
Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2007

Therefore, claim 1, and dependent claims 2-8, 11, and 12, which are dependent from claim 1, are allowable over Jones in view of Paranjpe and Nose et al.

Applicants submit that all of the claims remaining in the application are now allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nima A. Seyedali', is written over a horizontal line.

Nima A. Seyedali

Registration No. 61,293

KSC/NAS:jrh

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

107937_1.doc